

DRAFT

Date: October 4, 2004
Date of Meeting: September 13, 2004
Time: 7:00 p.m.
Location: Main Hall, Ellendale Volunteer Fire Company, Ellendale, DE
Topic: **Ellendale Area Working Group Meeting #2**
Attendees: See attached

Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Ellendale Area Working Group is scheduled for October 19, 2004, at 7:00 p.m. at the Ellendale Volunteer Fire Company.

A Public Workshop for the Ellendale Area is scheduled for November 18, 2004, from 4:00 to 7:00 p.m. at the Ellendale Volunteer Fire Company.

Action Items

- Member David Nutter to review the “Aesthetics” section of the Vision, Goals and Objectives and provide any recommended changes or additions.
- Project Team to implement recommended changes to Vision, Goals and Objectives.
- Project Team to address design suggestions from the breakout session (see attached).

Distributed

To Working Group Members

- Working Group Notebook Meeting #2 inserts

To General Public

- Bound copies of Presentation

Summary of Meeting Presentation and Discussion

Bob Kramer introduced himself and welcomed the members and citizens attending the meetings. All attendees introduced themselves.

Monroe Hite also welcomed the attendees. He stated that tonight the Working Group would be reviewing the first draft design concepts for the Ellendale Area. He

emphasized that the designs are not final and that they are intended to provoke discussion.

Mr. Kramer then reviewed the Working Group **Guidelines** that were distributed at the first meeting (7/20/04). He asked for any comments from the Working Group members, and none were spoken. He emphasized that Working Group members should use caution when discussing project issues with other members of their community. Members should only use “the Working Group thinks...” **phrasing** when the Working Group has actually stated a formal position on a particular issue.

Mr. Kramer also reviewed the **Vision, Goals and Objectives** that were distributed at the first meeting (7/20/04). He asked for any comments from the Working Group members. David Nutter stated that DelDOT should include an architectural and landscape design commitment because US 113 is a beautiful road today and DelDOT should commit to make it more beautiful in the future. Mr. Kramer asked Mr. Nutter to review the “Aesthetics” portion of the Vision, Goals and Objectives (see slide 14 of the presentation) and provide any suggested changes or additions. Mr. Hite added that “context-sensitive” design is an emphasis of DelDOT. Mr. Nutter also suggested that in the “Land Use” portion of the Vision, Goals and Objectives the wording, “Be consistent with Delaware Strategies, Sussex County, and Ellendale Comprehensive Plan” be changed to, “Coordinate with....”. **Bob Kramer suggested the wording “Coordinate and be consistent with...”**

It was agreed that that was acceptable.

Mr. Kramer referred to the **Constraints Map** that was mailed to Working Group members in August 2004. He asked the members to review the map and to inform the Project Team of any resources we may have missed. Floyd Toomey asked what are the “CRS” points indicated on the map. Katry Harris replied that they are Cultural Resources, for example, buildings, structures, and archeological sites over 50 years of age. She added that the Project Team will be learning more about these sites as the project progresses. Mr. Nutter stated that the State Historic Preservation Office, in its review of the Ellendale Comprehensive Plan, has requested that he identify a potential historic district in Ellendale. He followed that comment with more discussion with the Project Team after the meeting.

Mr. Nutter provided an update on the **Ellendale Comprehensive Plan**. He stated that the state agencies responsible for reviewing the plan had provided detailed comments on the draft plan. The comments identified issues with the proposed potential annexation areas. Sussex County, in particular, has urged extreme caution regarding annexation because its new sewer system does not reach the proposed annexation area. In addition, Mr. Nutter reported that the Office of State Planning Coordination is preparing a new Delaware Strategies for State Spending map that does not allow for development west of US 113 at SR 16. A public hearing regarding the plan is scheduled for September 21, 2004, at the Ellendale Volunteer Fire Company. He expects that the Town Council will approve the plan at its next meeting. **Mr. Nutter went over the plan through graphic representations. He emphasized the importance of the US 113 N/S Study and the Comprehensive Plan.**

Mr. Kramer then directed the members to the color foldout maps of the **draft designs** for the Ellendale Area. Mr. Wutka summarized the draft designs. The following issues were raised by Working Group members:

- Richard Ransom asked if the interchange proposed at US 113 and SR 16 would impact the Mt. Zion Church property.
- Chief Toomey pointed out that limited access to US 113 may result in increased local traffic on Road 213 such that upgrades to Road 213 may be necessary.
- Mr. Nutter reminded the group that the Ellendale Comprehensive Plan proposed improvements to the intersection of SR 16 and SR 213 including sidewalks.
- Brooke Clendaniel noted that an arrow on one of the ramps proposed at the interchange of US 113 and Road 565 was facing the wrong direction.

The members then divided into groups to review the draft design plans in detail. **When** the group reconvened, Project Team members reported summaries of what was discussed in each group. The following issues were discussed:

- If properties are purchased for the project, what happens to them?
- Could Staytonville Road (224) remain on alignment?
- Good idea to connect properties on east side of US 113 to Fleatown Road (224).
- Could SR 16 remain on alignment? SR 16 on alignment avoids the Mt. Zion cemetery and church property.
- The proposed interchange at US 113 and SR 16 works for emergency access.
- Consider access to VFW Road (607), especially for emergency vehicles.
- Consider access at West Robbins Road (579), especially for emergency vehicles.
- Because Road 565 is the boundary between two emergency service providers, access from both the north and the south off US 113 is needed here.
- How could farm machinery cross US 113, especially near SR 16? The back roads are too long.
- The proposed interchange at US 113 and SR 16 will facilitate development of parcels west of US 113.
- Try to avoid or minimize impacts on the Mt. Zion property.
- If the alignment of SR 16 is shifted, consider retaining the “old” SR 16 as a service road.
- What will be the speed on SR 16?
- Consider allowing “infield” properties to be used for highway service businesses.
- Improve Road 213 from Milford to Georgetown.
- We are planning to spend too much money to address the needs of out-of-staters. Need to balance spending for residents.
- Consider front access to property northwest of US 113 and SR 16 intersection.
- When does purchasing of property begin? Normally it occurs after approval of an environmental document, but the current Corridor Capacity Preservation Plan allows for “advance” acquisition.
- What is the timing of the proposed improvements? This plan may not be implemented for 10 to 15 years.

In addition, the citizens (not Working Group members) reviewed the draft plans. This group raised the following topics (some of which repeated the topics discussed by the Working Group):

- Why realign Staytonville Road (224)?
- How would farm equipment access occur?
- If the alignment of SR 16 is shifted, consider retaining the “old” SR 16 as a service road.
- Consider access to VFW Road (607)
- Consider access at West Robbins Road (579)
- Consider access for residents from Road 565, especially to northbound US 113.

Mr. Kramer asked for any additional comments from the attendees. He summarized the main points that he heard: access is the key issue, including access for emergency vehicles and farm equipment; alternative routes to US 113 for local traffic are good; need to reconsider realignment of SR 16 at proposed interchange.

David Dooley of DTC/DART provided copies of transit schedules. He stated that the 210 bus serves Ellendale. He indicated that DTC is working with Ellendale to install a bus shelter at SR 16 and Road 213. He indicated that the Sussex County Transit Working Group meets approximately every two to three months; the next meeting is September 23, 2004. Bishop Foster asked when the bus went to a reduced schedule. Mr. Dooley responded that the bus went to a reduced schedule at Labor Day, but will return to full schedule next summer. Harold Truxon asked if DTC has considered transit connections with the hospital in Wicomico County, Maryland. Mr. Dooley replied that DTC has tried to negotiate such service in the past, but that it has not been successful to date. He indicated that such an issue could be raised at the Transit Working Group and could result in action.

Mr. Truxon asked if Maryland and Delaware are working to develop a “superhighway” running east-west through Sussex County. He referred to a recent article regarding the controversy over the Denton (MD) bypass. Mr. Hite responded that Maryland is working to dualize MD 404. On the other hand, Delaware Joint Resolution 30 tasked DelDOT to examine an east-west limited access highway which could use an existing road like SR 404 or propose a new roadway. This issue has been studied twice before in Delaware but was rejected because of opposition. The Project Team will keep the Working Group informed on any substantive steps in the current DelDOT study.

Mr. Hite indicated that the next meeting of the Working Group would be on October 19th at 7:00 in the fire hall.

Mr. Kramer thanked the attendees for their participation and adjourned the meeting.

Meeting Summary prepared Katry Harris.